

Now I am a U.S. Senator, now in a position to change and help people save lives through public awareness; and that is my goal, to bring public awareness in line with the advances in medical science and technology that we have today.

Together with my colleagues, Senator SIMON, Senator DEWINE, and Senator LEVIN, we have just launched a drive to focus congressional attention on organ transplantation and to encourage every Member of Congress to consider signing up as an organ donor. We ask them to do three things: First, learn the benefits of transplantation; second, consider signing an organ donor card; and third, and probably most importantly, discuss their decision with their next of kin and loved ones.

So far, more than a third of my colleagues in the U.S. Senate have done so, and more are adding their names to this list every day. On the House side, Congressman JOE MOAKLEY of Massachusetts is urging his colleagues to do the same. We must continue to do this because just as our list is growing, so too is that list of children and men and women who are waiting for that transplant procedure.

I want to urge today every one of my Senate colleagues and every Member of the House to perform that heroic, life-saving act, which is selfless, unselfish, and sign an organ donor card to give others a new chance at life. Our goal is 100 percent congressional participation.

The week of April 21 through the 27th is National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week.

That is one month from now. On Tuesday of that week we will be having hearings in the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, dedicated to this issue of public awareness surrounding organ donation, tissue donation, and transplant patients. We can start right here by recognizing that public policy—and we, as legislators—can only do so much. The problem is the shortage of organs. The solution is public awareness. Doing our part, here today, and over the coming months to raise public awareness will go a long way in helping us achieve our policy goals, as well.

The 104th Congress has been unparalleled in the amount of attention that we have been able to focus on the important issues now before our Nation. This is one of them. We have the opportunity to give the most important service you will ever give to fellow Americans. Be a hero. Join the fight, and save a life.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, over the last 30 years, we have greatly improved the environment in the United States. Our air and water in

this country is the cleanest it has been in 40 years. Now we are at a crossroads in environmental policy. We can preserve all of the environmental gains of the past three decades and move forward to assure our children a safer, cleaner, and healthier environment. But we will not be able to do it under the old top-down, command and control solutions from Washington, DC.

This approach is outdated and counterproductive. Rather than advancing our important environmental goals, the Washington bureaucracy and its extremist allies are actually harming the environment. Timber growers have been known to cut trees on the basis of even a rumor that their property might have an endangered species to be listed. Why? In order to avoid having Washington bureaucrats tell them they cannot cut down a tree that they have spent their lifetime harvesting.

In central Texas, the Fish and Wildlife Service originally suggested setting aside an area the size of the State of Rhode Island to protect the golden-cheeked warbler. In order to do that, they told the property owners they could not cut cedar trees. Now, cedar trees have another harmful impact on the people who must have water for our cultivation of lands and to drink, because cedar trees absorb water to a greater extent than most other trees. If you do not cut cedar trees, which our farmers and ranchers are trying to do as much as they can, the water supply dries up, and it affects the water supply of the city of San Antonio and affects the ability of farmers and ranchers to use their land. The size of the area is a ridiculous amount—the size of the State of Rhode Island for one bird, when we could have set aside a reasonable number of acres for its preservation.

In the Texas Panhandle, protecting a bait fish called the Arkansas river shiner may keep both the agricultural producers and municipal utilities from being able to have access to an adequate supply of water, even though there is a thriving population of the Arkansas river shiner in the State of New Mexico. Now, many of my constituents are a little fed up with a Government that gives snakes and salamanders priority over human beings and constitutional rights.

The Endangered Species Act has worked well as a means of focusing attention on the need to preserve plants and animals from extinction. There have been many successes for high-profile species, but the heavyhanded means that are being employed to preserve hundreds of subspecies are increasingly counterproductive. If we cannot rely on the support and cooperation of the people who live with the animals that we want to save, I think those animals' chances of survival are not very good. That is why I am making a priority of reforming the Endangered Species Act. We need to forge a new consensus about saving endangered species and making private

property owners stakeholders, not adversaries in the process.

The Superfund was created to identify and clean up hundreds of hazardous waste sites around the country, but the regulations written in Washington to govern cleanup are so complicated and cumbersome that almost no cleanup is getting done. Only 291, or about 25 percent, of the 1,238 worst hazardous waste sites have actually been cleaned up.

Where is the money going? Billions of dollars have gone into this. The money has gone to lawyers, consultants, and bureaucrats in Washington. That is where the money has gone that should have been going to clean up these hazardous waste sites. Companies contributing to the cleanup have spent 39 percent of their money on lawyers, 20 percent on negotiations, 9 percent on studies, and 15 percent on cleanup.

It is not just business that is being sued. The Catholic Archdiocese of Newark has been sued for a landfill in New Jersey. The archdiocese purchased land to expand its Holy Name Cemetery and inadvertently became potentially responsible for its cleanup. One landfill site in New York has 600 defendants, including an Elks Club, an exercise gym, two nursing homes and a kennel, which has a septic tank that needs to be cleaned.

Something must be done. We must put the money where it will benefit the public and the environment. This waste will go on and on unless we reopen the Superfund law and put some common sense back into it. Hazardous waste sites are local problems. We want to have a voice at the local level to be sure that the waste site in a town is cleaned up and made safe.

Unlike other major environmental laws, it is all handled by Federal bureaucrats, not the State and local representatives. While the lawsuits have gone on for years and years and the consultants and the bureaucrats argue endlessly about how many parts per million is acceptable, our children are at risk.

The Clean Air Act requires States and localities to meet a series of ambitious new pollution reduction targets in the years ahead. Achieving these goals will make the air we breathe cleaner and healthier. But the Washington bureaucrats have not been content just to set the standards. They are also trying to dictate how to achieve the goals, down to the smallest detail. In order to reduce auto pollution, emission testing requirements are part of the Clean Air Act. Rather than allowing States to decide, Federal regulators have been using threats to force States to set up entirely new automobile inspection networks, completely separate from the existing State auto inspection systems, and it is costing our consumers millions of dollars.

What we need to do, Mr. President, is achieve better protection of human health and the environment by regulating smarter. The fact is, businesses—

big and small—private property owners, and commuters, are spending too much time, too much money, trying to comply with too much paperwork and too many regulations from too many Washington bureaucrats.

If we are going to move forward for a safer, cleaner, healthier future, we must change the way Washington regulates. States and communities should be allowed and encouraged to take a greater role in environmental regulations and oversight. But the improvements we need in Washington go far beyond State and local involvement. We need to plan for the future, not just for today.

Science and technology are constantly changing and improving, but the Federal Government is not keeping up with these changes, and the old regulations are outdated. Extremists in the environmental lobby are trying to keep the status quo. What we want are some immediate changes that will give us better regulations for the environment, to preserve it, and allow people the freedom to use their private properties and cultivate the land at the same time.

Mr. President, I know my time has expired.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period of morning business be extended until the hour of 1:30, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I will have 3 or 4 more minutes.

Mr. President, here are the things that I would like to see done to change the regulatory harassment from Washington, DC. Let us put some common sense into the regulation. Let us do a thorough review of the environmental regulations that are now in place to determine what we need, what we do not, and make sure we do not add any new unnecessary, unproductive regulations.

Washington should be required to disclose the expected costs of current and new environmental regulations. I think the public has a right to know how much they are going to cost, and whether they are going to get their money's worth.

Three, in trying to make regulatory decisions involving the environment, the Federal Government should use best-estimate and realistic assumptions, rather than worst-case scenarios advanced by environmental extremists.

Fourth, new regulations should be based on the most advanced and credible knowledge available—in other words, good science. We have a situation where we have seen the devastation of the timber industry in the Northwest. It has cost thousands of people their jobs. Their families and their livelihoods have depended on the timber industry. It has cost every person in America that has built a new home more because timber prices have increased. Why? To protect a spotted owl.

Mr. President, what has happened is that reports have come back that, in fact, the spotted owl is not going into extinction, that it has been spotted in places nearby. So we have had a devastation of an industry, a devastation of people's lives and their livelihoods, their jobs, and whole communities have been ruined, when we did not even have good, sound science.

In Texas, in the city of Big Springs, 15,000 people had to move a reservoir to protect a concho snake that was later determined to be prolific in a county nearby. They spent \$6 million in taxpayer money—the money of hard-working people—to move a whole reservoir in order to accommodate a snake that was not really endangered.

So, Mr. President, it is time to restore common sense to environmental law. This is how we would move forward for a cleaner, safer future for our country, and to protect private property rights and jobs as we do it. We can work together to keep endangered species, to clean air and water, and clean hazardous waste sites. We can do all of these things and still have a thriving economy.

Mr. President, that should be our goal, and that is why we are trying to reform Superfund, reform the Endangered Species Act, and make the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, and the Safe Drinking Water Act good for people as well as animals and the environment. We need to work together so we can live together in safety.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized to speak for up to 15 minutes.

APPOINTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN SENATE COMMITTEES

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 236, submitted earlier today by Senator DOLE and Senator DASCHLE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 236) appointing Members to certain Senate committees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the resolution appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

So the resolution (S. Res. 236) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 236

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of the Standing Rules of the Senate,

the following Members are hereby appointed to the following Senate committees:

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS: Mr. Bennett and Mr. Wyden.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION: Mr. Abraham and Mr. Wyden.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Grams and Mr. Wyden.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING: Mr. Warner and Mr. Wyden.

THE PASSING OF DAVID PACKARD—INDUSTRIAL GIANT

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, last Tuesday, an industrial giant died, David Packard, a former Deputy Secretary of Defense during the Nixon administration. I have a letter sent to me as chairman of the Seapower Subcommittee by the Secretary of the Navy.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter to me be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, DC, March 27, 1996.

Hon. WILLIAM S. COHEN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Seapower, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, David Packard passed away Tuesday, March 26, 1996. I would like to submit the following statement for the Congressional Record.

We are deeply saddened by the passing of a great American and a true friend of the Department of the Navy, David Packard.

David Packard, together with his friend and Stanford University classmate, Bill Hewlett, sparked the development of the high technology industry from a one car garage back in 1938, to a giant in the electronics industry as the Hewlett-Packard Company. He set a new standard in management style that became known as "the HP Way", which emphasized "management by objective, rather than by directive" and encouraged employees to work toward common goals by giving them a wide range of freedom in which to operate. He created more than just a company, he created an industry and a management philosophy.

Mr. Packard served as Deputy Secretary of Defense under Secretary Melvin Laird where he developed a reputation for candor and independent thinking and a tendency to challenge political influence on defense decisions. He was part of a team that is considered by many to be one of the strongest teams ever to run the Defense Department.

A decade ago he made another huge and enduring contribution to good government. He chaired the Packard Commission, which recommended a revolution in defense procurement procedures through the application of standard business practices. His recommendations are still being implemented today. They enable the military to modernize more quickly and at a lower cost.

Although he was one of the richest men in America, he lived modestly. He donated the bulk of his wealth to a foundation that has given hundreds of millions of dollars to Stanford University, the Monterey Bay Aquarium, and other charitable causes.

David Packard was a giant in industry, in public service and philanthropy. We will miss him greatly.

Sincerely,

JOHN H. DALTON,
Secretary of the Navy.